

Virginia Saltwater Development Fund Evaluation of a Proposal for the Development of a Research or Data Collection Project

Project Number: 1206-16

Date: 2/10/2007

Title: P) Effects of Piscivorous Fishes on Local Juvenile Game Fish Populations.

“The Virginia Saltwater Recreational Fishing Development Fund is to be used solely for the purpose of conserving and enhancing finfish taken by recreational anglers, enforcing laws related to natural resource conservation, improving recreational fishing opportunities, obtaining necessary data and conducting research for fisheries management, and creating or restoring habitat for species taken by recreational fishermen.”

Code of Virginia, Section 28.2-302.3

NOTE: Please read the entire scoresheet before beginning, then provide comments, and circle () the appropriate score for each item. Thank You.

A. Problem Description and Resolution (20 points)

- 1. Comment on the adequacy of the problem description, background information, knowledge of available literature/data sources, and anticipated benefits.**

Poorly done. Literature citations and sources are lacking. Problem described is part of a cycle that is expected in an estuary's ecosystem, no surprise.

- 2. Describe your views on the conceptual approach to solve the problem.**

Though the diet information will be informative, even if but a snapshot of the York and poor glance at the James and Rappahannock, this study will not provide answers to effects on juvenile populations or provide a better estimate of natural mortality.

SCORE (Circle one)

Poor

0

5

10

15

Excellent

20

B. Soundness of Project Design/Technical Approach (25 points)

1. Is there sufficient information to technically evaluate the proposal?

Only for the diet study sampling design and analysis of stomach contents but not for the stated objective or expected results.

2. What are the strengths/weaknesses of the project design (thoroughness, practicality, methods, integration with other work, etc.)?

It is only a one year snapshot of diets in the York primarily, a weak look at the James and Rappahannock, and the integration is not clear.

SCORE (Circle One)	Poor					Excellent
	0	5	10	15	20	25

C. Project Management and Experience/Qualifications of Personnel (15 points)

What is your opinion of the experience and capabilities of the Principal Investigator(s) to manage and conduct the work, the availability of facilities, and education and experience of assisting personnel.

Drs. Musick, Onley, and Mann are well respected and extremely capable investigators. No familiarity with P. McGrath.

SCORE (Circle one)	Poor			Excellent
	0	5	10	15

D. Project costs (15 points)

Is the budget realistic and reasonable? Indicate any unreasonable costs.

Vessel fuel costs seem low for what is planned, as well as personnel, as one would assume more than one person is going to assist with the boat, gillnets, measurements, etc., but this was not presented in the budget.

SCORE (circle One)	Poor			Excellent
	0	5	10	15

E. Value of the Project to Fisheries Managers (25 points)

Do you believe the results of this project will further management of the species described? Will the results be useful to managers?

Other than a snapshot diet study that been done in other regional systems that should be comparable (but maybe Virginia is extremely different and unique), more details are needed to determine whether this project actually produced useful long-term management results.

SCORE (circle one)

Poor

Excellent

0

5

10

15

20

25

PLEASE ADD ANY FURTHER COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSALS BELOW: